UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,237	04/13/2001	Robert Van Kommer	P&TS-33226	6191

116 7590 11/26/2010

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER	
VO, HUYEN X	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/835,237
Filing Date: April 13, 2001
Appellant(s): KOMMER, ROBERT VAN

Robert F. Bodi
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 9/1/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed 3/27/2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application: 1-5, 7-24, 26-28, 30-50, and 52-66.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6792086	Saylor	1-2000
6341264	Kuhn	2-1999
6487277	Beyda	7-1998
6510417	Woods	3/2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15, 18-24, 26-28, 30-39, 42-50, and 52-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6792086) in view of Kuhn et al. (US 6341264).

Regarding claims 1, 30, and 53-65, Saylor et al. disclose a voice portal hosting system, intended to be connected to a first voice telecommunication network in order for a plurality of users in said network to establish a connection with the system using voice equipment in support of the ordering of products and/or services from any of a plurality of independent value-added service providers, said system comprising:

a memory in which a plurality of interactive voice response applications providing interactive response functionality is stored, each of said applications including an executable component for execution by said hosting system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45*);

a common speech recognition module (*voice to text system 62 in figure 3*);

a user identification module for identifying a user (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*);

uploading means for independently uploading said plurality of interactive voice response applications, to said system in advance of any ordering of said products and/or services, by said plurality of independent value-added service providers (*col. 20, line 64 to col. 21, line 45 and or referring to figure 3, content provider 70 provides information to VPAGE Server 22; uploading information to the central server before it could be retrieved by the user*), and wherein the identified user interacts with one or more of said interactive voice response application (*col. 8, lines 1-38, identified is allowed to access voice services*), and wherein each of said interactive voice response applications includes an executable component for execution by said hosting system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45; these are executable components*).

Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose means for storing a plurality of user-specific speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module; means for retrieving the user-specific speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models; and wherein said one or more interactive voice response applications utilize said retrieved user-specific speech models via said common speech recognition module for recognizing speech of the identified user; said user-specific speech model is further adapted to the specific user during said ordering of said product and/or services from any one of said service providers such that said further adapted model is then utilized for future ordering of products and/or services from any other of said service providers.

However, Kuhn et al. teach means for storing a plurality of user-specific speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module (*figure 7, speaker adaptation*); means for retrieving the user-specific speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*); and wherein said one or more interactive voice response applications utilize said retrieved user-specific speech models via said common speech recognition module for recognizing speech of the identified user (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*); and said user-specific speech model is further adapted to the specific user during said ordering of said product and/or services from any one of said service providers such that said further adapted model is then utilized for future ordering of products and/or services from any other of said service providers (*referring to the operation of figure 5 and/or col. 9, line 29-67; using input speech data to adapt speaker-dependent models for the user*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy by using user-specific speech models.

Regarding claim 50, Saylor et al. disclose a method for allowing each of a plurality of independent value-added service providers to set up an interactive voice response applications each including an executable component for execution by a voice portal hosting system commonly used by said plurality of valued-added service

providers and which can be used by a plurality of users (*the operation of figure 1, multiple users access voice services at the server having a common speech recognizer, and independent service providers connected to the server providing voice response applications*), said method comprising the steps of:

independently uploading, through a second telecommunication network, said interactive voice response applications to said system for providing interactive voice response functionality (*col. 20, line 64 to col. 21, line 45 and or referring to figure 3, content provider 70 provides information to VPAGE Server 22*);

identifying a user calling said system (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*);

retrieving speech models for the speech recognizer (*voice to text system 62 in figure 3, uses system speech recognition models to recognize speech*);

executing one or more of said voice response applications in response to the user calling said system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45*), said executing including interacting with said user via said common speech module using said retrieved speech model for recognizing the speech of the user (*voice to text system 62 in figure 3, uses system speech recognition models to recognize speech*), wherein each of said interactive voice response applications includes an executable component for execution by said hosting system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45; these are executable components*).

Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose means for storing a plurality of user-specific speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module; means for retrieving the user-specific speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models; and wherein said one or more interactive voice response applications utilize said retrieved user-specific speech models via said common speech recognition module for recognizing speech of the identified user; said user-specific speech model is further adapted to the specific user during said ordering of said product and/or services from any one of said service providers such that said further adapted model is then utilized for future ordering of products and/or services from any other of said service providers.

However, Kuhn et al. teach means for storing a plurality of user-specific speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module (*figure 7, speaker adaptation*); means for retrieving the user-specific speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*); and wherein said one or more interactive voice response applications utilize said retrieved user-specific speech models via said common speech recognition module for recognizing speech of the identified user (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*); and said user-specific speech model is further adapted to the specific user during said ordering of said product and/or services from any one of said service providers such that said further adapted model is then utilized for future ordering of products and/or services from any other of said service providers

(*referring to the operation of figure 5 and/or col. 9, line 29-67; using input speech data to adapt speaker-dependent models for the user*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy by using user-specific speech models.

Regarding claim 52, Saylor et al. disclose a voice portal hosting system allowing a plurality of users to establish a connection with said system using voice equipment for interacting with one or more of a plurality of service providers, said system comprising:

means for independently uploading a plurality of interactive voice response applications from said service provides, to said system, via a communication channel (*col. 20, line 64 to col. 21, line 45 and or referring to figure 3, content provider 70 provides information to VPAGE Server 22*), each of said voice response applications for providing interactive voice response functionality for a corresponding one of said service providers when executed by said hosting system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45*);

means for storing said plurality of interactive voice response applications (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45*);

a common speech recognition module (*voice to text system 62 in figure 3*);

means for storing a plurality of speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module (*voice to text system 62 in figure 3, uses system speech recognition models to recognize speech*);

a user identification module for identifying a user calling said system via another communication channel (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*);

means for retrieving the speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models (*voice to text system 62 in figure 3, uses system speech recognition models to recognize speech*), wherein

the identified user interacts with one or more of said interactive voice response applications (*col. 8, lines 1-38, identified is allowed to access voice services*); and

wherein each of said interactive voice response applications includes an executable component for execution by said hosting system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45; these are executable components*).

Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose means for storing a plurality of user-specific speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module; means for retrieving the user-specific speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models; and wherein said one or more interactive voice response applications utilize said retrieved user-specific speech models via said common speech recognition module for recognizing speech of the identified user; said user-specific speech model is further adapted to the specific user during said ordering of said product and/or services from any one of said service providers such that said

further adapted model is then utilized for future ordering of products and/or services from any other of said service providers.

However, Kuhn et al. teach means for storing a plurality of user-specific speech models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module (*figure 7, speaker adaptation*); means for retrieving the user-specific speech model of the identified user from said plurality of models (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*); and wherein said one or more interactive voice response applications utilize said retrieved user-specific speech models via said common speech recognition module for recognizing speech of the identified user (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*); and said user-specific speech model is further adapted to the specific user during said ordering of said product and/or services from any one of said service providers such that said further adapted model is then utilized for future ordering of products and/or services from any other of said service providers (*referring to the operation of figure 5 and/or col. 9, line 29-67; using input speech data to adapt speaker-dependent models for the user*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy by using user-specific speech models.

Regarding claims 2-5 and 31-35, Saylor et al. further disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein said common speech recognition module comprises a common

user profile database (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), and wherein said common user profile database includes user preferences (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), and wherein said user preferences include a delivery address for goods and/or services ordered with said value-added service providers (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), wherein said user preferences include a billing address and/or preferences for goods and services ordered with said value-added service providers (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), wherein said common speech recognition module uses user-specific speech models (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15, voice print authentication*).

Regarding claims 20-24, 26-28, and 44-49, Saylor et al. further disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a common billing module and a common clearing center for dispatching the collected amounts to said value-added service providers (*Billing Module 46 in figure 2*), wherein said common billing module allows for the billing of transactions between said users and said value-added service providers on a common bill prepared by the operator of said voice portal hosting system (*Billing Module 46 in figure 2*), and wherein at least a plurality of said users have a deposit account on said voice portal hosting system which can be used for transactions with a plurality of said value-added service providers (*Billing Module 46 in figure 2*), wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a user authentication module based on an electronic signature and/or on biometric parameters of said users (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15, voice print authentication*), wherein said second telecommunication network

is a TCP/IP network (*col. 14, lines 5-25 and/or referring to network 20 in figures 1-3*), wherein at least some of said interactive voice response applications are described with VoiceXML documents (*col. 21, lines 10-45*), wherein at least one free interactive voice response application is made available by the operator of the system (*col. 21, lines 10-45*), and wherein said free interactive voice response application includes a free directory assistance service (*col. 36, line 53 to col. 37, line 8*).

Regarding claims 7-8 and 36, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein said common speech recognition module uses user-specific speech models, means for adapting said common speech models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications, and wherein said means for adapting said common speech models uses recorded users' speech samples for adapting said common speech models off-line.

However, Kuhn et al. teach speech recognition module using user-specific speech models (*figure 2, speech recognizer uses adapted speech models*), means for adapting said common speech models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications (*figure 7 or 34 in figure 2*), and wherein said means for adapting said common speech models uses recorded users' speech samples for adapting said common speech models off-line (*the operation of figure 7*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

Regarding claims 9-10, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system of claim 1, wherein said common speech recognition module uses Hidden Markov Models, and further comprising a Hidden Markov Models adaptation module for adapting said models to said user, and wherein said Hidden Markov Models adaptation module allows for an incremental adaptation of said models. However, Kuhn et al. teach a common speech recognition module uses Hidden Markov Models, and further comprising a Hidden Markov Models adaptation module for adapting said models to said user (*figure 7*), and wherein said Hidden Markov Models adaptation module allows for an incremental adaptation of said models (*figure 7*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

Regarding claims 11-12 and 37-38, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein said common speech recognition module uses user-specific language models, and means for adapting said common language models

associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications. However, Kuhn et al. teach a common speech recognition module uses user-specific language models (*the operation of figure 7 and elements 32; 34; 26 in figure 2*), and means for adapting said common language models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications (*figure 7, speaker adaptation is done during speech dialog with the system*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

Regarding claims 15, 18-19, 39, and 42-43, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a common user identification module run on said system, wherein said user identification module uses a voice-based user identification module, wherein said common speech recognition module uses a speaker-dependant speech recognition algorithm, and wherein said speaker is identified by said common user identification module.

However, Kuhn et al. further teach that at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a common user identification module run on said system, wherein said user identification module uses a voice-based user identification module,

wherein said common speech recognition module uses a speaker-dependant speech recognition algorithm, and wherein said speaker is identified by said common user identification module (*the operation of figure 2*).

Since Saylor et al. and Kuhn are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Kuhn et al. in order to identify the user and the user's profile for used by the speech recognition to improve speaker recognition accuracy by using speech speaker-dependent codebook trained by users in advance.

Regarding claim 66, Saylor et al. further disclose the method of claim 65, wherein said adapted retrieved user-specific speech and language model is made available for use by all others of said interactive voice response applications of the other providers (*speech recognizer of Saylor inherently includes speech models and language models in order for the recognizer to function*).

Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6792086) in view of Kuhn et al. (US 6341264), as applied to claim 1, and further in view Beyda et al. (US 6487277).

Regarding claims 13-14, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose a voice portal hosting system of claim 1, wherein said common speech recognition module uses

selections previously made by said users, and wherein said selections previously made by said users are stored in said voice portal hosting system for improving the arborescence of the menus. However, Beyda et al. teach common speech recognition module uses selections previously made by said users, and wherein said selections previously made by said users are stored in said voice portal hosting system for improving the arborescence of the menus (*see abstract*).

Since Saylor et al. and Beyda et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Beyda et al. in order to tailor the presentation order to the needs of each individual user to improve system's efficiency.

Claims 16-17 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6792086) in view of Kuhn et al. (US 6341264), as applied to claims 15 and 39, respectively, and further in view of Woods et al. (US 6510417).

Regarding claims 16-17 and 40-41, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose that the user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network, and being operated by a telecom operator of said first telecommunication network, wherein said user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network

even when said identification is not available for the other B-subscribers of said first telecommunication network. However, Woods et al. teach that the user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network, and being operated by a telecom operator of said first telecommunication network, wherein said user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network even when said identification is not available for the other B-subscribers of said first telecommunication network (*col. 24, lines 39-41*).

Since Saylor et al. and Woods et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Woods et al. in order to allow the system to automatically authenticate users based on their phone numbers by using caller-ID procedure.

(10) Response to Argument

Applicants argue to traverse the prior art of record based on the limitation regarding "user-specific speech models are updated while a user is ordering from one service provider [and] the update models are also utilized when the user later orders from another provider" (*second paragraph, page 28 of the appeal brief*). As indicated in previous office actions that Saylor only teaches a common speaker-independent speech recognizer for all users. Kuhn et al. was relied upon for the teaching of a speaker

adaptation technique in which the common speaker-independent speech models are adapted to the speech of a new user (*col. 9, lines 29-62, and/or col. 4, line 56 to col. 5, line 8 and/or the operation of figure 5*). Kuhn et al. also teach that the adaptation is performed while the user ordering from the service provider (*col. 2, lines 4-7, adaptation is performed while transaction being processed; col. 9, lines 31-35; note that eigenspace is constructed offline from a population of speakers. The adaptation is, however, performed online as soon as speech of the new user is available while ordering services; also col. 9, lines 58-62; iterative adaptation; also referring to col. 5, lines 21-26; as soon as the user's spoken request is received, adaptation is performed*).

In response to applicant's argument regarding the operation of figure 5 showing initially construction of speech model rather than updating speech model (*page 29 of the appeal brief*), according to the detailed description of the operation of figure 5 (*column 9, lines 29-62*) speech of new speaker is used to adapt existing speech models to generate adapted speech models for the new user. The adaptation is performed iteratively (*col. 9, lines 58-62; adapted speech models are further adapted*)

In response to applicant's argument regarding "Saylor reference fails to teach uploading interactive voice response application including executable component" (*pages 31-32 of the brief*), Saylor et al. teach a VPage execution module (*34 in figure 2*) for executing the content of the Vpage, which is in voice-based XML format (*col. 18, lines 48-67; the VoiceXML is well-known to includes instructions inherently encoded in*

the tags or markers telling the execution module 34 what to do with the VoiceXML document, i.e. generating call menu or other tasks; The present application's specification also describes VoiceXML documents being executed and interpreted before sending to the user (page 8, line 1-20 of the original specification)). Furthermore, it is inherent that VoiceXML includes instructional tags/markers to enable the execution module (*34 in figure 2*) where in the Vpage to begin executing (i.e. synthesizing speech from text). In fact, Saylor et al. disclose program instructions (*in Vpage executing module 34 in figure 2*) for executing the VPage in accordance to tags or markers in the VoiceXML document (*col. 18, lines 48-67; The present application's specification also describes VoiceXML documents being executed and interpreted by the system (page 8, line 1-20 of the original specification)*)

In response to applicant's argument regarding improper combination of Saylor and Kuhn references (*pages 33-34 of the appeal brief*), Saylor et al. teach a client-sever system in which multiple service providers upload their products or services to the server's database (*50 in figure 3*) for users to access. Saylor et al. also teach a common speech recognizer for recognizing spoken request from a large population of users (*39 in figure 7*). Saylor et al. fail to teach a user-specific speech model for each user. However, Kuhn et al. teach the use a speaker adaptation process to adapt the speaker-independent speech models to the speech of each new user; that is to make speaker-independent speech models to become user-specific speech models. Kuhn is only relied upon for the teaching of such speaker adaptation process. From the

teaching of Saylor et al. and Kuhn et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to recognize that "the results of the combination were predictable" (KSR). Kuhn et al. further suggest that using speaker-adapted speech models will improve speech recognition accuracy (*col. 7, lines 59-62*).

In response to applicant's argument regarding "speaker independent models are used for a new user prior to updating user-specific speech models to make the new user into a known user" (*last paragraph, page 39 of the appeal brief*), Kuhn teaches adapting speaker-independent speech recognition models to a given speaker using speech characteristics of that given speaker (*column 4, lines 15-24; for a new speaker, the speaker-independent models have to be used for the new speaker to adapt to the speech of the new speaker; it is not known how long before adaptation the speaker-independent models are used for the new speaker and what operation they are used for. Therefore, it is interpreted as retrieving the speaker-independent models for the speaker before adaptation takes place*).

In response to applicant's argument regarding "identifying a user calling said system as a known user or a new user" and "retrieving the user-specific speech model of the known user ..... training phase" (*pages 40-41 of the appeal brief*), Kuhn et al. teach an identification module (*42 in figure 2 and/or col. 5, line 49 to col. 6, line 10*) for identifying the speaker as known or unknown speaker and retrieving and adapting speaker-independent models to the speech of the unknown user (*col. 4, lines 15-24*).

In response to applicant's argument regarding "speech recognition module comprises a common user profile database including user preferences" (*page 43 of the appeal brief*), Saylor et al. teach a user profile database storing user's personal information and preferences (*col. 18, lines 1-10*).

In response to applicant's argument regarding "storing a plurality of user-specific speech and language models adapted to specific users for use by the common speech recognition module" (*page 45 of the appeal brief*), Saylor et al. teach a speech recognizer (*speech recognition 39 in figure 7; speech models and language models are inherently included in the speech recognizer*), which inherently include acoustic models and language models in order for speech recognizer to function in recognizing. In order for a speech recognizer to function, it must include at least acoustic models. Language models are, however, also well-known to be included in speech recognizer for limiting the speech recognition candidates to most likely expected candidates. In fact, Saylor et al. do explicitly teach a dynamic grammars (language models), which are dynamically created for the user at runtime (*col. 30, lines 19-50; these grammars include words that are expected to be spoken by the user for a particular application).*

Regarding independent claims 63-65 and other dependent claims, these claims were rejected under the same grounds as previous independent and dependent claims.

Applicant's arguments for these claims are similar to that of other independent claims and are addressed above.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Huyen X. Vo

/Huyen X Vo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Conferees:

/David R Hudspeth/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/James S. Wozniak/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626